DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 144 486 HE 009 274

AUTHOR	Van de Graaff, John
TITLE	The Structure of Academic Governance in Great Britain. Yale Higher Education Program Working Paper.
INSTITUTION	Yale Univ., New Haven, Conn. Inst. for Social and Policy Studies.
SPONS AGENCY	Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.; National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	YHEP-13
PUB DATE	Nov 76
NOTE	59p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Program of Comparative and Historical Studies of Higher Education, Institution for Social and Policy Studies, Yale University, 1732 Yale Station, New Haven, Conn. 06520
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Administrative Organization; *Educational History; *Foreign Countries; *Governance; *Higher Education; Institutional Administration; *Post Secondary Education As a Field of Study; *Universities; University Administration
IDENTIFIERS	*Great Britain

ABSTRACT

University government in Great Britain, as in so much else in British society, is the complex product of an extended process of historical development. The British university ideal and the structures of academic government owe much to the venerable tradition of Oxford and Cambridge, sometimes reinforced by the heritage associated with the five Scottish universities founded in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Yet the contemporary forms of the British university rarely go back more than a century. Apart from "Oxbridge" and the old Scottish foundations, no British university had been established before the nineteenth century, and half the present number received university status after World War II. The result is a paradoxical combination of strong adherence to tradition, both in ritual and symbol and in day-to-day practice, and of considerable de facto flexibility and adaptability. (Author)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

THE STRUCTURE OF ACADEMIC GOVERNANCE IN GREAT BRITAIN

by

John Van de Graaff

YALE HIGHER EDUCATION PROGRAM
WORKING PAPER

YHEP-13

November 1976

The research reported in this paper has been part of the Yale Higher Education Program. It is a draft of a chapter to appear in Academic Power: Patterns of Authority in Seven National Systems of Higher Education (tentative title), edited by John H. Van de Graaff (forthcoming). It has been supported by research funds from the National Institute of Education and the Lilly Endowment Fund for the comparative study of academic organization and governance.

In the interest of fullest possible circulation of information and ideas, the Institution for Social and Policy Studies reproduces and distributes these Working Papers at the request of authors who are affiliated with the ISPS. They are not edited or reviewed, and the views in them are those of their authors.

Content of this Working Paper is not for publication or for quotation without permission. A list of the Working Papers of the Program may be obtained from the address below.

Program of Comparative and Historical
Studies of Higher Education
Institution for Social and Policy Studies
Yale University
1732 Yale Station
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

6. GREAT BRITAIN

by John Van de Graaff

University government in Great Britain, as so much else in British society, is the complex product of an extended process of historical development.[1] The British university ideal and the structures of academic government owe much to the venerable tradition of Oxford and Cambridge, sometimes reinforced by the heritage associated with the five Scottish universities founded in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Yet the contemporary forms of the British university rarely go back more than a century. Indeed, apart from "Oxbridge" and the old Scottish foundations, no British university had been established before the nineteenth century, and half the present number received university status after World War II. The result is a paradoxical combination of strong adherence to tradition, both in ritual and symbol and in day-to-day practice, and of considerable de facto flexibility and adaptability.

Oxford was in existence as a university by the end of the twelfth century, and Cambridge was founded shortly thereafter, following a temporary cessation of lectures at

Oxford in 1209. In the course of the fourteenth century, with royal support, they consolidated their position as national institutions monopolizing higher learning in England. At the outset their structure followed the same faculty divisions as on the Continent, but gradually the residential colleges came to predominate. With the ascendency of collegiate organization there occurred a corresponding shift in mission, from professional training to moral education--the inculcation of aristocratic, gentlemanly virtues within the framework of the established church and through a close relationship between teachers and taught. This was a mission analogous to that of the arts or philosophical faculties on the Continent, as institutions of general education, but those faculties remained preparatory and subordinate to the professional faculties at least until the eighteenth century, while in Oxbridge the professional faculties atrophied.

By the eighteenth century, Oxford and Cambridge were in a state of advanced decay. They served few outside the Anglican upper class, excluding members of all nonestablished faiths; the education they provided was of dubious standard, largely nonvocational in character and nearly completely divorced from British intellectual and scientific life. The

fellows of the richly endowed colleges, who controlled their affairs, rarely taught and were often not even residents. The tradition of academic self-government, which to this day remains a crucial element in the powerful spell still exerted by Oxbridge over the rest of British university life, lay virtually dormant for many decades.[2]

The institutions founded during the nineteenth century for the most part attempted to fill the gap left unfilled by Oxbridge and to provide opportunities for higher education open to members of nonestablished religions. These university colleges--which later became the civic universities--were provincial institutions, drawing most of their students from their own regions.[3] Most were founded by local notables and, to a certain extent, responded to the requirements of industrial development by offering relatively specialized courses suited to the pursuit of middle-class careers. None of these institutions had authority to grant degrees to their students, who therefore had to sit the external examinations of the University of London, chartered in 1836 purely as an examining and degree-granting body. The new colleges therefore tended to teach the London curricula.

At the end of the nineteenth century, aside from the

venerable Scottish universities, there were six full-fledged universities in Great Britain. The University of London was still no more than an examining body for the dozen or so university colleges and other institutions in London and the provinces, although it was then being reorganized to assume a teaching role in London as well, on the basis of an Act of Parliament passed in 1898. All of the other five universities were federations of colleges, in one form or another: Oxford and Cambridge, Durham (founded in 1832), Wales (1893), and Victoria (1880, centered on Manchester). The latter two institutions, each of which linked three colleges in different cities, exemplified a federal structure that many viewed as an appropriate way to upgrade the status of the remaining provincial university colleges, freeing them from the academic apron-strings of London examinations while ensuring standards and avoiding too great a fragmentation. When Birmingham was chartered as a unitary university by Act of Parliament in 1900 and soon thereafter Liverpool petitioned to break loose from the Victoria federation and receive similar status, the issue of federal versus unitary structures became acute. To consider Liverpool's petition, the prime minister appointed an ad hoc committee of the Privy Council

(the vestigial government body that to this day must formally recommend the granting of a royal charter to the Queen). The committee recommended the dissolution of Victoria University, thereby establishing the unitary institution as a pattern for the future. Altogether six university colleges were chartered as independent, unitary universities in the decade between 1900 and 1909.[4] Standards in these institutions were to be maintained by outside professors as external examiners, chosen so that they would have the last word and "could not be overruled by the in situ professor."[5]

Between the wars only one provincial college was elevated to university status (Reading in 1926). However, the central government steadily increased its financial support for the universities. Beginning in 1889, it appointed a series of ad hoc committees to provide grants to selected institutions, and in 1919 it established a permanent body, the University Grants Committee (UGC) which, then as now, included a majority of academic members. The UGC was placed under the Treasury, not (as is commonly supposed) to ensure greater university autonomy than would be likely under an administration also responsible for the rest of education, but because the Treasury's authority covered the

entire United Kingdom whereas the (then) board of education was responsible only for England and Wales.[6] Although intended as more than a mere channel for the distribution of Treasury funds, the UGC aimed at the outset only to stimulate the universities to plan their own development more comprehensively than they would otherwise have done. In 1925, for example, it urged that each university attempt to formulate a "definite policy, in the light of which the many problems of its future development...can be considered and decided." Among the factors to be weighed were "the general needs of the nation and the interests of university education as a whole." In 1946 the national Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals noted that the universities "will be glad to have a greater measure of guidance from the Government than until quite recent days they have been accustomed to receive." Soon afterward, the government expanded the UGC's terms of reference to include assisting in "the preparation and execution of such plans for the development of the universities as may from time to time be required in order to ensure that they are fully adequate to national needs."[7]

As World War II ended, the UGC's contribution to the universities' overall income had risen to about one-half, from the one-third that it had provided in 1920, and by 1967 the proportion was to reach nearly three-quarters of the total.[8] On its list of receiving institutions in 1946 were sixteen universities, including one in Wales and four in Scotland. By 1962 six more university colleges in the provinces had been chartered as independent universities. Sussex University (chartered in 1961) initiated a series of eight entirely new foundations within six years, and between 1964 and 1967 ten technological institutions were raised to university status, most of which had been designated as colleges of advanced technology (CATS) in 1957. Two universities were formed by the fission of long-standing partnerships (Newcastle left Durham, and Dundee split from St. Andrews in Scotland). Thus there are now forty-two full-fledged universities in Great Britain, including the federal University of Wales (now with five units) and eight in Scotland.[9] In the fall of 1973, there were 245,000 full-time students at these universities.[10]

In conventional parlance, the universities are termed the "autonomous sector" of higher education, due to their legal

autonomy granted by royal charters. There also exists a large and diverse nonuniversity sector of higher education (called the "public sector" in Britain), for which overall policy is set by the central government but which is mainly under the day-to-day control of local (municipal) authorities. This nonuniversity sector has evolved rapidly since 1965, when the government declared its so-called binary policy with the aim of ending the process of promotion from nonuniversity to university status which the CATs then were just completing. Since the boundary between the two sectors of higher education was henceforth to remain sealed, the nonuniversity institutions would supposedly lack any further motivation to neglect their distinctive technological and vocational functions in the pursuit of university status. To serve as a capstone for that sector, thirty polytechnics were formed in 1969-70 from the amalgamation of more than sixty of the leading technical colleges, with the intent of concentrating nonuniversity degree-level work in them.

Currently, nonuniversity higher education consists of two main segments: the polytechnics, which now enroll nearly half of their students for university-level degrees; and a larger number of technical and other colleges with varying proportions

of students in degree-level and other advanced courses.[11] Most of the teachers colleges, which until very recently represented a substantial nonuniversity segment, are currently amalgamating with polytechnics or technical colleges.

The difficulty of characterizing the nonuniversity sector is compounded by the fact that--except for the fast-disappearing teachers colleges--it is formally considered part of further education, a vast sector that includes some 700 colleges offering varying mixtures of degree-level, advanced-level, and secondary-level work, plus several thousand evening institutes. By 1970, the number of students (both part-time and full-time) at all levels in the colleges of further education had exceeded two million.[12] Among these were 88,000 full-time students in advanced and degree-level programs. Nonuniversity higher education as a whole (including the 116,000 students then still enrolled in teachers colleges) represented just over half of the total full-time enrollment in all of higher education, a proportion that was still growing at that time.[13]

In this brief review of the historical development of British higher education, certain points are of particular significance for our study of academic government. First,

British universities have traditionally been open to lay influence, to an extent surpassed only in U.S. institutions. The nineteenth-century foundations initially made little provision for participation by teaching staff, which was consonant with the relative dormancy of academic self-government in Oxbridge. Lay persons held large majorities on the governing bodies, court and council, of the new institutions and were extremely influential. Today, although lay influence has significantly diminished, lay persons are still in a majority on the governing bodies and occasionally play a decisive role.

As lay influence declined, that of academics grew, in part through informal involvement in day-to-day affairs and in part through the influence of the many Oxbridge products who became professors at the new institutions. (As late as 1961-62, 31 percent of all university teachers were still from Oxford and Cambridge. Academics who both studied and began teaching there had very high prospects of reaching a professorship if they moved to another university.[14]) With the tradition of their own universities in mind, these scholars sought academic self-government, and by 1900 a structural pattern had been set which, although deviating from the

collegiate structures at Oxbridge, was to permit steadily increasing academic control in the civic universities during the twentieth century. This pattern was first found in embryo at University College, London, which established an academic senate in 1832. However, the real landmark was the formation of an essentially modern mixture of lay and academic government at Owens College, Manchester, in 1870, which quickly became the norm.[15]

This two-tier structure--to be analyzed more fully in the following section--had, as the first tier of government, a large and inactive court and a smaller executive council, each with large lay majorities but some academic members. Court and council bore formal responsibility for all institutional affairs. The main role of the council, most of whose members were locally recruited, was to seek financial support, which came from a variety of chiefly private and even local sources at the outset. At the second tier of government was an academic senate consisting of the principal (later vice-chancellor) and the professors in charge of the various subjects, which soon were organized largely as departments. From the turn of the century on, the senates "began to acquire both formal rights and, more important,

extensive customary rights of decision-making."[16] Often the appointment of a strong vice-chancellor or principal facilitated this shift of power, just as the strong American university presidents of the turn of the century effectively reduced the authority of lay boards of trustees and prepared the way for increased faculty powers.

Another manifestation of Oxbridge influence is the persistence of the British concept of the university as a community with moral education as its chief task. The ideal institution--like the Oxbridge college--is small-scale and residential, "affording close contact of teachers with taught in a shared domestic life."[17] Although nowadays, residence is more the exception than the rule, in 1966-67 more than one-third of all British students lived in colleges or other university accommodations.[18] The department is usually quite small, at least by Continental standards, and the overall student-teacher ratio has traditionally been kept at around eight to one. The graduates of each university form an organized body--a community, however diffuse, that persists and can potentially influence the development of the institution.

Because of the importance still accorded to moral education, vocational training tends to play only a secondary

part in the British universities' view of their mission, although courses of a vocational and technological nature have had a place in the universities since the latter part of the nineteenth century.[19] In 1930, Abraham Flexner, impassioned advocate of the research university on German lines, was able to cite critically numerous vocationally oriented diplomas and certificate courses, such as brewing in Birmingham and automobile engineering in Bristol.[20] Yet as the universities outgrew their provincial origins, they tended to shed such lower-level courses, which could be equally well taught in the growing technical colleges. The main path to "parity of esteem" with Oxbridge did not lead to emphasis on professional instruction; although higher-level technology held its place within the universities, their preeminent mission remained the education of gentlemen. By and large, the universities' relations with industry have never been particularly close, even in the nineteenth-century days of lay enthusiasm for the new civic institutions. At no point have the universities contributed significantly to Britain's economic development, and this undoubtedly was a factor in the mid-1960s decision to establish the binary policy and to emphasize separate provision for professional

and industrial courses in the polytechnics. The government felt that the need for such courses could probably never be fully met by the universities, due to their distinctive nonvocational tradition.

A further legacy of Oxbridge is the national character of the university system. Notwithstanding the provincial origins of the civic universities, most major steps affecting the development of the system has been taken or decided at the center: for example, the first real alternative to Oxbridge was established in London (University College), and the chartering of new universities has always been a matter for government decision. The establishment and growing strength of the UGC is also evidence of the accelerating trend toward central policy-making. Clearly, however, although British universities form a genuinely national system they have not been under state auspices to the extent that the Continental universities are.

Overall, the historical evolution of British universities, to use a phrase of Robert Berdahl's, provides numerous variations "on a typical British theme, namely the operation of forces to bring about substantial changes without causing any break in the outer fabric."[21] Academic institutions have changed

gradually, with practice seldom being constrained by the letter of constitutional or statutory provisions. Pragmatic interplay between the "dignified" and the "efficient" aspects of government, as Walter Bagehot distinguished them, is as evident in the universities as in politics per se.[22] Just as the monarch and the House of Lords lend legitimacy to the actual conduct of British government through Parliament and the Cabinet, so the monarch, on the advice of the Privy Council, charters universities, symbolically conferring autonomous power on the lay court and council which today they largely yield to the vice-chancellor and the academic senate as the efficient aspects of university government. In both the political and the academic realms, the dignified part of government acts as a check on the powers of the efficient part. Such a system, more than most political institutions in other countries, greatly depends on a tightly woven fabric of trust and understanding among those who bear policy-making responsibility.

LEVELS OF CONTROL

The lowest level of British university structure[23] is almost universally the department, which embraces a teaching subject

or discipline in a manner analogous to the American case. Based on Scottish precedent and German influence, this organization by subject developed in the new foundations of the nineteenth century. As in Germany, authority for the subject was normally entrusted to a chairholding professor, who almost always became the head of department as more formal organization crystallized. From the outset, assistants were recruited and, increasing steadily in number, they outnumbered the professors by two or three to one by the early 1900s.[24]

Since World War II the nonprofessorial staff structure has become standardized. It now includes readers, senior lecturers, and lecturers. In 1973, professors represented 12 percent of all staff paid wholly from university funds; readers and senior lecturers, 22 percent; and lecturers, 63 percent.[25] Readers, although now paid on the same scale as senior lecturers, still tend to be appointed on the basis of their research accomplishments and enjoy somewhat more prestige than senior lecturers. who are generally promoted internally on the basis of their teaching ability; both are appointed permanently. Beginning lecturers normally serve a three-year probationary period and then receive permanent appointments.

Within the department the professorial head retains formal supremacy, although a certain proportion of headships are held by nonprofessors. Moreover, most professors serve in departments with at least one other professor. Thus, at a given time, as many as half the total number of professors may not be department heads.[26] Traditionally, the hierarchy of authority within the department has been less severe than in Germany or Italy,[27] and formal provisions for some democratization of decision making are now common. Most frequently these take the form of departmental boards including all staff and sometimes student representatives. Some boards have only advisory authority and limited scope.

As on the Continent, at the next level there is the faculty, which groups related departments. The pattern of division into faculties is comparable to that in Europe, although with somewhat greater variation from university to university. Organizationally, the decision-making body is the faculty board, which normally includes all professors, as well as the nonprofessorial heads of departments and sometimes all readers and senior lecturers. This group of ex officio members is normally augmented by representatives of the other staff, up to an equal number. Thus the board may become very large, with up to fifty or a hundred members at the larger universities.

The dean of the faculty, as its executive and chairman of the faculty board, is elected by the board. Usually a professor, the dean serves a two- to three-year term in most faculties and may be supported by one or more subdeans who are often from the nonprofessorial staff. In some professional faculties, especially medicine, the dean is full-time and has permanent tenure.

Organization at the university level is complex, more so than the traditional Continental institutions, with features somewhat resembling American structures. There are four main organs. The first two, court and council, form the top organizational tier. The senate forms the second tier. The vice-chancellor, as the chief academic and administrative officer of the university, links the two tiers.

In many charters, court formally retains supreme authority within the university, although its function is still largely ceremonial. It now ranges in size from 50 or so to more than 600 (as at Sheffield); the average is perhaps 250. The members include local notables and municipal officials, representatives of associations and groups of all kinds, and from the university, representatives of graduates, staff, and (increasingly) students. Court meets annually in most cases.

Its most important potential role is as a link to local informed public opinion.

The council is more important than court in the government of the university. Ordinarily much smaller than court, it has an average of thirty members. Lay members, from a similar range of groups as on court, are still in the majority on councils. However, academic membership is on the rise, from roughly 20 percent on the councils of the unreformed civic universities to the 40 percent and more granted in the charters of some of the newest universities. The council meets six to ten times a year, usually once a month in term time. Its primary domain of responsibility is finance, and the planning and maintenance of the physical plant; in addition, it formally confirms staff appointments. The council does most of its work through committees, of which the most important is usually the planning committee, often formed jointly with senate. The university is linked with the outside through the lay membership of the council and its committees (as well as the vice-chancellor). Council members are likely to be useful locally, for example in negotiating for acceptance of the university's site and construction priorities by local authorities. Sometimes

laymen serve as impartial mediators on intrauniversity matters, as when they "chair working parties charged with the allocation of resources in an atmosphere of competition."[28]

At the university level, except for the vice-chancellor, the senate is the only governing organ that deals directly with the faculties and the departments. It bears virtually complete authority for formulating university-wide academic policy; in this sense it is a fairly close equivalent of the German or Italian academic senate. It generally consists of all professors in the university plus nonprofessorial department heads and certain other ex officio members, as well as elected representatives of the nonprofessorial staff. Like the faculty boards, the senate can be unwieldy, ranging in size from about 50 to more than 200. The trend is toward limiting ex officio seats to a very small number, with a broader range of elected representatives, thereby increasing senate's representational character and reducing its size. Senate meets with roughly the same frequency as council and also does nearly all of its business through committees. There is often an executive or steering committee, chaired by the vice-chancellor and including the deans and various other members elected by senate, which prepares and expedites the senate's deliberations.

Perhaps the most fascinating aspect of British university government is the position of the vice-chancellor, who is denoted by charter as the "chief academic and administrative officer" but is otherwise endowed with virtually no formal powers.[29] The academic side of the vice-chancellor's role is important; although for some years there has been a tendency to recruit more often from the lay world, more than three-quarters of vice-chancellors in office in the mid-1960s came from the ranks of academics, and on the whole they behave more as academics and less as administrators than do American university presidents. The vice-chancellor is appointed by the council, often on the nomination of a council committee including senate members (or a joint senate-council committee); he must in any case have the support of both council and senate. He usually takes office in his fifties or (increasingly) his forties and serves an indefinite term, typically until retirement in his mid-sixties.[30] This length of tenure helps to make the vice-chancellor "normally the most important single figure in any university."[31]

The vice-chancellor derives his influence and authority, not from statutory provisions, but from a number of sources. First, as chairman of senate and usually of its committees, the vice-chancellor serves "very much [as] an executive chairman

proposing decisions rather than someone to arbitrate between debators."[32] As chief administrator he is at the focal point of communication within the university and, in particular, he represents the main link between senate and council. On council, he is chief spokesman for the academic viewpoint; yet at the same time he can rely on the lay members' support, since they play the main formal part in his appointment and therefore tend to regard him as their man. The very existence of council serves to bolster the vice-chancellor's meager formal powers, for he can often hold up a measure that he opposes simply by suggesting that he would find it difficult to recommend to council. However, when matters do reach committees or the full council, the academic side normally has the vice-chancellor's support and thus prevails, even in the rare cases when there is lay opposition.[33] Although less dominant than it used to be, the vice-chancellor's role in finance and the budgetary process is central: He is normally the key member of the finance committee of council. He is also responsible for the university's relations with outside institutions and groups, most notably the UGC and the National Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals.

Having threaded our way through the complexities of

structure at the university level, let us briefly sketch the distribution of responsibility within the university for matters of curriculum, appointments, and budget. Curriculum and examinations are largely departmental matters, although to maintain degree standards there is in each subject an external examiner, always from another university, who has the final word on examinations. Basic aspects of curriculum, such as course and degree structures, are subject to approval by faculty and senate. Normally the faculty board gives the department's proposals more searching scrutiny than does the senate, for the bulk of the board members are usually from related fields.

Professorial appointments are normally proposed by a committee of council, with an academic majority, whereas the appointment of nonprofessorial staff is more typically handled by a senate committee, on which the department head will have a powerful voice, and with council playing at most a confirmatory role.

The budgetary process falls into two parts.[34] First, the departments make proposals in preparation for the submission made by the university to the UGC every five years. These proposals are reviewed at faculty level and are then examined

by the responsible university officers, often including a senate committee; final approval is given, usually routinely, by council and its finance committee. Once the size of the UGC's grant is known, the reverse process takes place, with the disposable funds apportioned by council between nonacademic and academic purposes, and the academic portion then divided by senate between general services and the departments as the lowest level units. The role of those members of the university with the greatest administrative responsibility--the professorial department heads, the deans, and above all the vice-chancellor and other senior officials--tends to be even greater in financial matters than in academic affairs generally.

Lord Ashby has provided a vivid interpretation of this policy-making process:

> Academic business...flows from below upwards. It originates in departments or faculty boards; it ascends as recommendations to the senate. The senate may hold it up or refer it back; only rarely would the senate change it....Finally (there may be several other steps) it comes to the governing body, the council, as a recommendation to be approved.

> The council, like the senate, may hold it up or refer it back; it would be a grave breach of convention for the council to change it.[35]

Ashby sees such an upward flow of academic business as the most desirable "technique for working almost any form of [university] constitution."[36] It may indeed be an accurate description of the decision-making process in British universities much of the time, but it has its negative side. Indeed, one administrator criticized the "haphazard distribution" of his senate's policy-making attention in terms that put Ashby's in quite a different light: "...in its progress up the ladder from department to faculty board to senate to council, a proposal becomes a rubber stamp without at any point being an effective decision--and so responsibility is lost between the rungs of the ladder."[37]

A more precise assessment of the relative power of the different levels would be that--on academic matters at least--decisions are made usually in departments and sometimes in senate, with the faculty serving "essentially [as] an intermediary body."[38] Although the power of senate over lower levels is limited, the potential influence of the

vice-chancellor must always be reckoned with. Therefore, organization at the university level in Britain must be classified as somewhat more hierarchical than the traditional Continental systems. Altogether the triad of senate, council, and vice-chancellor possesses a distinct capacity for aggregating, coordinating, and unifying policies for the university as a whole. Indeed, substantial measures, such as the founding of new departments, must be handled primarily at that level, often by a long-term planning committee.

Insofar as traditional Contenental systems--especially those of Germany and Italy--permit any concentration of power above the institute or the individual professor but within the university, it is primarily at the faculty level. The university-wide academic senates are weak, or even virtually nonexistent as in France. However, on the Continent, the state provides at least as great a force for uniformity and coordination as does the relatively strong university level in Britain, so that in practice the differences may not be very great. Nevertheless, academic involvement in policy making is certainly higher in Britain, for the large senates typically include all professors and a substantial number of nonprofessorial staff, and the influence of the vice-chancellor

as chief academic officer promotes a certain degree of unity and coherence. More than "any other individual within the university," he bears "an unmistakeable responsibility to speak for and think about the university as a whole."[39] In much of his work, the vice-chancellor relies on support from a number of relatively senior and experienced academics, including the deans. The fragmentation among departments, as small hierarchical units at the lowest level, is thereby to some extent overcome at the university level by informal reduction of the large oligarchy of professorial "barons" to a small one operating in league with the vice-chancellor on senate, council, and their committees.[40]

Before turning to the national level, we can deal briefly with the two federal universities at Level 4--Wales and London--left over from the period around 1900, when it appeared that federal rather than unitary universities might become the dominant pattern in Britain.[41] The constituent units of Wales have virtually complete autonomy and are so widely scattered that they hardly comprise even an informal system. London, with some forty-four units and 31,500 full-time students in 1968, is more significant from our perspective. Its role as an examining body for institutions

in Britain and overseas is diminishing, although it still had nearly 34,000 external students in 1968. London's court (equivalent to council elsewhere) amounts to a counterpart (for London) of the University Grants Committee, distributing funds among the units. Moreover, the university has established "a very extensive system of service and specialist support for its autonomous units" of a sort that may well be needed elsewhere as more cities and metropolitan regions acquire greater numbers of university-status institutions.[42]

A regional level of university government does not exist in Britain.[43] Nationally, power is shared by the Department of Education and Science (DES, formerly the Ministry of Education) and the University Grants Committee, although the autonomous Research Councils (under the DES) allocate the bulk of support for research in universities and other institutions. The UGC, which was transferred from the Treasury to the DES in 1964, traditionally serves as a "buffer" between government and the universities, helping to maintain the latter's autonomy. It consists of some twenty members, of whom three-quarters are from universities and the rest from other sectors of education and from industry, in roughly equal portions. Members serve overlapping terms

of five years, sometimes renewed, and are appointed by the government, after consultation with the chairman but often without the prior knowledge of the current members. All are part-time, except for the full-time chairman, and serve in their personal capacities, not as delegates of the group or institution from which they come. Significantly, service on the UGC is probably the single most common path to a vice-chancellorship.

The UGC's main function is to distribute central government funds for recurrent and capital expenditures to the universities. Beyond that, it provides advice and guidance to universities and government alike on all aspects of policy. Thus it has served as the key instrument, although a subtle one, for university planning in Great Britain since its formal establishment in 1919. In the late 1950s, for example, the UGC played a crucial role in foreseeing the rise of students numbers that was likely to come in the 1960s, in getting the government to raise its projections, and in laying the groundwork for the new foundations of the 1960s.[44] Customarily, the UGC makes its grants by quinquennium. Thus every five years, usually in conjunction with visitations by the UGC, the universities

must go through the process of assessing their budgetary needs and deciding how much to ask for. On the basis of the universities' proposals, the UGC presents a detailed submission to the DES and receives its five-year allocation as a lump sum. The UGC then apportions this among the universities, ostensibly as it sees fit, although since relations between the UGC and the DES are confidential it is difficult to know to what extent the latter may express its preferences, and the Treasury, as provider of the funds, may also play a role.

The universities receive their grants as lump sums. In principle they have been free to use grant funds as they wish. However, for some time the UGC has offered funds earmarked for particular fields that it wished to support. In distributing the quinquennial grant for 1967-72, the UGC issued for the first time a "Memorandum of General Guidance,"[45] together with specific letters to each university informing them (for example) which of their proposed projects had been taken into account in making the grant. The universities will want to be on firmer ground than ever if they deviate from the UGC's expectations. In Lord Annan's opinion, the UGC is in the process of "becoming

a ministerial sub-department, though without direct ministerial control....The trend of the times is transforming it into a watchdog trained to bark at what were once its masters."[46]

The UGC is responsible only for the universities; nonuniversity higher education is under a complex blend of central and local government control. The government's current policy for that sector and, more than ever, for higher education as a whole, is so recent that we will deal with it in the final section.

Certain major interest groups, above all the Committee of Vice-Chancellors and Principals (CVCP), and secondarily the Association of University Teachers (AUT), and the National University Students (NUS), increasingly vie for influence with the UGC and the government.[47] Until recently, however, the immense prestige of the UGC as a neutral advocate of the universities' views rendered advocacy by other groups relatively ineffective. The bulk of the universities' relationships with the government still run through the UGC, and government-UGC contacts are confidential, so that groups find it difficult to intervene. Links between the UGC and the vice-chancellors are close, doubtless

facilitated by the fact that the academic members of the UGC belong to the elite of their universities. Moreover, as already noted, former UGC members often become vice-chancellors.

STRUCTURAL EVOLUTION AND POLICY TRANSFORMATION

The past decade has witnessed an acceleration of the kinds of intrauniversity structural changes noted in the preceding section--above all in the direction of broader participation in academic government. Despite the large cumulative effect of these changes, they have occurred gradually and pragmatically, in characteristically British fashion, with the letter of statutory instruments lagging behind actual developments.

Greater internal democratization of academic authority has been common in both the old and the new universities and represents, in a sense, an extension of the shift from lay to academic control noted above. Although the charters of the early twentieth century reserved academic participation in government almost exclusively to professors, even when they were already outnumbered by other staff,[48] democratization

of government proceeded gradually as nonprofessorial staff were included first on committees and then on the parent organs. Nationally, the AUT, whose membership included an increasing majority of nonprofessorial staff, exerted the main pressure for such participation, beginning just after the First World War. Today nonprofessorial representation, although limited overall, tends to be strongest on the faculty level, where the number of nonprofessorial staff often approaches half of the total membership. At university level, many of the new charters deprive professors of their ex officio seats on senate, to make it a smaller and presumably more efficient body. Within most departments, provisions for collective decision making now exist, often spurred by senate recommendations. Arrangements vary greatly, however; "a-constitutional and hierarchical departments" persist.[49] Reducing hierarchical authority within the universities is a complex task, and changes at one level must be complemented by changes at another. In particular, the voice of nonprofessorial staff members at university and faculty level appears to be most effective when they also have a say within their departments.

Demands by students for participation are much more recent than those of the nonprofessorial staff, and they

intensified sharply after the mid-1960s. Most universities met the pressure by granting student membership on committees, whether specially established staff-student bodies or regular committees of senate or council. Such moderate concessions, which had already served as the initial response to nonprofessorial demands for participation over many years, usually satisfied a majority of the students, isolating the radical leaders and thus often defusing the agitation. By now, most councils and many senates have student members. In notable contrast to Germany, nonprofessorial staff did not provide much support for the students, precisely because their own position relative to the professors had substantially improved over time. Altogether, as one observer noted, "manifestations of student protest in Britain have been short in duration, limited in scope and size, and restrained in action," relating this partly to the difficulty British protestors had in linking "wider political problems to the more local questions of university development....It is characteristic of the British situation that the possibility of establishing such global-local relationships has been limited."[50] In light of the evolutionary and pragmatic character of British political culture, this is not surprising.

So far a distinct although modest rise in the power of nonprofessorial staff and students has been achieved, at substantial cost to the power of professors. The position of laymen and administrators is less clear. As the majority group on council, laymen collectively have clearly lost power. Yet there is as much scope for influence on the part of individual laymen as ever, and perhaps more, for the growing complexity of the nonacademic side of university affairs inevitably entails more frequent needs for expert outside advice.[51] For the same reasons, the influence of specialized, full-time university administrators is probably growing. They have always played a more important part in British universities than on the Continent, where many administrative tasks were assumed by civil servants directly responsible to their governments. Yet scepticism regarding the role of administrators is widespread, and there appears to be little inclination to expand their function to anything like the American pattern. Generally the traditional system of government by vice-chancellors supported by amateur professorial oligarchies persists, although these elites must take ever-increasing account of the

desires of other groups within the university.

Although the new universities were in large part intended as sources of innovation, their governing structures are hardly novel. They conform to the evolutionary pattern just outlined and have made little independent contribution to it. "On the whole," noted the UGC as early as 1964, "we should have welcomed in the statutes of the new universities some greater changes in the system of university government."[52] The most interesting changes in the new universities are below the university level. The new structures appear in some cases to have established effective nuclei of authority at Level 2--a significant departure from the traditional constellation of weak faculties and strong departments. Schools or boards of studies have replaced faculties and departments, to foster interdisciplinary teaching across traditional lines. In theory, such schools assume some or all of the authority that traditionally rested with the department and its head, further tempering the traditional subordination of junior staff to a professor. However, such changes have often had only a limited effect. Where schools are large, department-like particularisms tend to develop within them, either informally or formally, as in Lancaster,

where "the Boards of Studies are as much federations of sovereign Departments as are traditional Faculties."[53] Where the units are relatively small they hardly differ from large departments.

The major innovation in this period was the Open University, which began its first courses in 1971 with 25,000 students. Structurally it is truly a national-level institution, under the direct authority of the DES rather than the UGC. Thus its rate of expansion depends entirely on the budgetary allocation provided by the DES and the Treasury. Although the Open University admits all applicants on a first-come, first-served basis, it confers degrees that are fully up to British standard, guaranteed partly by the familiar device of the external examiner.

In 1962 the Privy Council, which must approve royal charters, prepared a model charter to guide the numerous bodies then in the process of drafting charters for new foundations.[54] The model was a vague and cautious document that retained much that was conventional and traditional. It did, however, provide for up to one-third of senate to consist of elected nonprofessorial staff (a substantial proportion at that time). The model charter was the closest the British have come to

anything remotely resembling the comprehensive legislation on university structure which has been enacted in France, Sweden, and Germany. In 1966 the Privy Council, evidently on DES advice, took a stand on student involvement. Although not going as far as the NUS would have liked, the Privy Council gave its belssing to joint staff-student committees of the sort which were to become common over the next three years.[55]

At the national level, the government has taken a series of policy decisions for higher education as a whole which are affecting its development in an abrupt manner. These decisions have established a clear "parity of governmental esteem" for the nonuniversity sector, headed by the polytechnics, thereby diminishing the universities' preeminence within higher education and rendering their traditional status as the "autonomous" sector effectively obsolete.

The quantitative growth of student enrollments which took place in the 1960s has been associated with the Robbins Committee, which reported in 1963, and its guiding principle "that courses of higher education should be available for all those who are qualified by ability and attainment to pursue them and who wish to do so."[56] That principle was immediately accepted by the Conservative government of the

day and succeeding governments have held to it. Yet the UGC and the education ministry had foreseen that expansion and had been preparing for it since the end of the 1950s; the Robbins Committee's main function was to legitimize it.

Otherwise, "the real significance of the Robbins Report is that it has been systematically repudiated since 1964, by Conservative as well as Labour Governments."[57] Robbins recommended a ministry for science and the universities, separate from a ministry for education, to ensure their independence; instead, the government created an all-embracing Department of Education and Science, and placed the UGC under it. Later, the universities' financial accounts were opened to the Public Accounts Committee of Parliament and the Comptroller and Auditor General. Although the CATs were promoted to full university status as planned, no further CATs were designated for promotion in the coming decade as Robbins proposed; rather, the DES created thirty polytechnics to head the nonuniversity sector and barred them from ever attaining university status. Although the Robbins Committee recommended the establishment of a validating body to monitor the conversion of the future CATs into universities, the DES created such a body, the Council for National Academic Awards,

for the far-reaching purpose of validating degree courses to be given independently by the polytechnics. Rather than absorbing the teachers colleges into the universities, as Robbins proposed, the DES decided to merge them with the polytechnics, to form the basis for two-year liberal arts courses leading to a newly created Diploma of Higher Education (Dip.H.E.). The 1974 Houghton Report awarded the teaching staff in polytechnics salary scales virtually equivalent to those in universities.[58] Altogether, the DES "has deliberately shrunk [the universities'] position within the system,[59] while consolidating and substantially strengthening the nonuniversity sector. Moreover, after inflation destroyed the UGC's grant to the universities for the 1972-77 quinquennium, the entire system of quinquennial block grants has been abandoned, with no immediate prospect of its restoration.

The polytechnics have been controversial ever since the first ones were formally designated in 1968. They were intended to strengthen and concentrate the further education tradition by providing both degree-level and diploma-level programs, largely with a vocational orientation, to full-time and part-time day and evening students. Critics charge, however,

that the polytechnics are in fact neglecting their lower-level courses and part-time students, thereby diminishing opportunities for older and working-class students, in just the sort of "academic drift" or quest for higher academic status which the bar to their promotion as universities was intended to prevent.[60] By the fall of 1975, although growing steadily in most areas, the polytechnics were having trouble recruiting students in some of their degree courses, mainly in science and technology, thereby adding to the surplus of unfilled places already existing in those fields in the universities.[61]

Such duplication of provision can only add to growing doubts about the government's policy for higher education. The driving force for the various measures--incremental in themselves but adding up to sweeping changes in overall structure--appears to have largely come from civil servants within the DES.[62]

As the full import of its measures have become apparent, the DES has been increasingly criticized for excessive secrecy and lack of consultation. A group of OECD examiners, though praising the DES for the quality of its planning techniques, sharply criticized its limited consultation with interested groups and its reluctance to make public the data

on which its policies were based. The examiners linked these tendencies, at least by implication, to the powerful role of the permanent civil servants within the DES, stressing "the momentum of thought and action within a Department composed of career officials who have long known one another, who have the same training and prospects, and who work within a common tradition and point of view."[63]

This is the negative side of the British reliance on policy making through close informal interaction among cohesive communities of elites. Such a process depends greatly on a high degree of trust and mutual understanding among the persons involved.[64] The UGC and the key vice-chancellors could easily protect the interests of the universities as long as such institutions were in favor with the Treasury and the DES. But as the universities have recently fallen from grace, their defenders are weakened: The UGC is left to dole out an ever decreasing share of the total allocation for higher education and has no higher authority to appeal to. It now seems clear that the government has the power to alter the underpinnings of higher education in Britain--conventions and informal understandings--without warning.

NOTES

Chapter 6 -- Great Britain

1. As used in this chapter, the terms Great Britain and British refer to England, Wales, and Scotland, although often predominantly referring to England.

2. For an overview of the history of university government, see Graeme C. Moodie and Rowland Eustace, Power and Authority in British Universities (Montreal: McGill--Queen's University Press, 1974), pp. 25-44, and Rowland Eustace, "The Origins of Self-Government of University Staffs," paper prepared for the Annual Conference of the British Sociological Association, 1970.

3. A. H. Halsey and Martin Trow, The British Academics (London: Faber and Faber, 1971), p. 40; in 1908 between 73 and 87 percent of the students at four civic universities came from within thirty miles; even at University College, London, 66 percent did so.

4. These events are recounted in detail by Eric Ashby and Mary Anderson, Portrait of Haldane at Work on Education (London: Macmillan, 1974), pp. 60-74.

NOTES
Chapter 6 -- Great Britain

5. Ibid., p. 64. London University can be considered as a special case of the external examiner system, and it continued to serve as an examining institution for higher education institutions in Britain and (increasingly) overseas.

6. Ibid., pp. 150-152.

7. The various passages are cited in Robert O. Berdahl, British Universities and the State (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959), pp. 60, 61, 76.

8. Halsey and Trow, British Academics, p. 63.

9. The UGC's grants list included a small number of other institutions without full university status. Northern Ireland possesses the Queen's University of Belfast and the new University of Ulster.

10. University Grants Committee, Annual Survey: Academic Year 1973-74 (London: H.M.S.O., 1975), p. 6.

11. It is difficult to define the lower boundary of nonuniversity higher education precisely, because technical colleges enroll greatly varying proportions of students in courses preparing for degrees or for other advanced level diplomas and certificates (mainly Higher National Diplomas and Certificates); technical colleges which are considered

as part of higher education enroll a substantial proportion of students in such advanced courses, which are broadly defined as higher than the Advanced Level of the General Certificate of Education (GCE A-Level), qualifying for university. For a description of the various types of advanced work, see Leonard M. Cantor and I. Francis Roberts, Further Education in England and Wales (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969), pp. 46-55.

12. Further education below higher education includes students enrolled for courses at a level roughly equivalent to secondary education (GCE A-Level), preparing for such qualifications as Ordinary National Diplomas and Certificates; for a description of the various types, see Cantor and Roberts, Further Education, pp. 55-73. The boundary between nonuniversity higher education and the rest of further education is fuzzy in the extreme, and the problem of compiling statistics is immensely complicated because many colleges offer degree, advanced, and nonadvanced courses side by side, for full-time (including sandwich) students, and day and evening part-time students as well.

13. Cf. John Pratt and Tyrrell Burgess, Polytechnics: A Report

(London: Pitman Publishing, 1974), p. 55. The relative development of the two main sectors is currently somewhat distorted by the amalgamation of the teachers colleges into the rest of nonuniversity higher education, which is associated with a sharp cutback in the number of student teachers in training. But in the longer term it is certain that nonuniversity enrollments will grow faster than those in universities.

14. The figures are from the survey commissioned by the Robbins Committee and are cited in Halsey and Trow, British Academics, pp. 224-226. In a 1968 mail survey (with a response rate of 68 percent), reported in Harold Perkin, Key Profession: The History of the Association of University Teachers (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969), pp. 238, 260, 29.5 percent of the respondents recruited to university teaching since 1960 had attended Oxford or Cambridge--a lower proportion than older cohorts, but still strikingly high.

15. Moodie and Eustace, British Universities, pp. 29-30.

16. Ibid., p. 31.

17. Halsey and Trow, British Academics, p. 67.

18. University Grants Committee, University Development 1962-1967 (London: H.M.S.O., 1968), p. 202.

NOTES
Chapter 6- Great Britain

19. Eric Ashby, Technology and the Academics: An Essay on Universities and the Scientific Revolution (London: Macmillan, 1963), pp. 55-64.

20. Altogether, Flexner did give the British universities relatively high marks on the German standard, observing that the former had "not run wild, as have our American institutions" and that degree-level work was "fairly" well protected from "excrescences" of technical training such as those cited in the text; Abraham Flexner, Universities: American, English, German (New York: Teachers College Press, 1967), pp. 229-332.

21. Berdahl, British Universities, pp. 132-133; the reponsibility for this particular use of the phrase is mine.

22. Walter Bagehot, The English Constitution (New York: Doubleday, n.d.).

23. I have relied heavily on Moodie and Eustace, British Universities, in the following discussion of levels of control, especially for internal university government. Other useful recent works on university organization are Hugh Livingstone, The University: An Organizational Analysis (Glasgow: Blackie, 1974), from a sociological perspective, and J. Fielden, G. Lockwood, and R. A. Nind, Planning and Management in

Universities: A Study of British Universities (London: Chatto & Windus, 1973), intended as a practical handbook on university administration.

24. See the illustrative figures provided in Moodie and Eustace, British Universities, pp. 38-39.

25. University Grants Committee, Annual Survey 1973-74, p. 6.

26. According to figures from the Robbins Report cited by Halsey and Trow, British Academics, pp. 375-376, in 1961-62 80 percent of professors were department heads (a figure which has certainly decreased sharply since) and 26 percent of departments were headed by nonprofessors (a figure which may have declined, as the top men in professor-less departments were given professorships).

27. The report cited in Chapter 2 on Germany provides comparative insight into relative degrees of hierarchy; the British academics visiting German universities were negatively impressed by "the domination exercised by a small number of senior professors," who "too often hold fast to these authoritarian controls." We may conclude that British dons were (or at least viewed themselves as) considerably less authoritarian than their German colleagues. See "The

Universities in the British Zone of Germany," Report of the Delegation of the Association of University Teachers, University Review 19 (May 1947):210, 212.

28. Fielden et al., Planning, p. 67.

29. This and the following paragraph are especially indebted to Moodie and Eustace, British Universities, pp. 126-153, passim. The "administrative" aspect of the vice-chancellor's role was added to charters after World War II.

30. The federal and collegiate universities (London, Wales, Oxford, Cambridge) all have rotating vice-chancellors. Fielden et al., Planning (P. 52) observes that the twenty or more years which a vice-chancellor appointed in his forties may expect to spend in office (assuming he does not resign) may be too long a period, but they see no alternative to unlimited tenure if the vice-chancellor is to have sufficient power to exercise leadership. However, a recent report on the structure of the University of Kent recommended a limited ten-year term for the vice-chancellor; Times Higher Education Supplement, 30 April 1976.

31. Moodie and Eustace, British Universities, p. 129.

32. Moodie and Eustace, Power and Authority, pp. 132-133;

the quotation is cited there from Jack Straw, Students Today (Young Fabian Pamphlet No. 17, 1968), p. 24.

33. One of the very few cases of exaggerated lay influence--and certainly the most notorious--was dramatized by events at the University of Warwick in 1970; see E. P. Thompson, ed., Warwick University Ltd: Industry, Management and the Universities (Baltimore: Penguin, 1970), as well as the more dispassionate analysis in Moodie and Eustace, British Universities, pp. 234-241.

34. Moodie and Eustace, British Universities, pp. 173, 176.

35. Eric Ashby and Mary Anderson, Universities: British, Indian, African (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), p. 303.

36. Ashby, Technology, p. 108.

37. From an internal memo by a university registrar, cited by Moodie and Eustace, British Universities, p. 77.

38. Moodie and Eustace, British Universities, p. 67.

39. Ibid., p. 146.

40. Halsey and Trow, British Academics, p. 111, note that expansion without reform of governing structures "has had the unintended consequences of producing both a professorial

oligarchy and Senates so unwieldy as to give rise on the one hand to smaller circles of power within the Senate and fragmentation of power to 'barons' who run departments." In their survey of academic staff, 77 percent of the respondents agreed with the statement: "A serious disadvantage of Redbrick universities is that all too often they are run by a professorial oligarchy" (p. 377).

41. Oxford and Cambridge, of course, are also federally structured in the sense that they consist of constituent colleges. However, they are certainly more unitary and less dispersed than either Wales or London.

42. Moodie and Eustace, British Universities, pp. 49-50.

43. The government's white paper on devolution of control to Wales and Scotland, published in November 1975, envisages their universities as continuing under the central UGC. There have been proposals for regional councils within England (for example by the Council of Local Education Authorities in September 1975, for further education only), but they appear to have little prospect of realization.

44. Harold Perkin, "University Planning in Britain in the 1960's," Higher Education 1 (1972):111-119.

NOTES
Chapter 6 -- Great Britain

45. The text of the memorandum is in University Grants Committee, University Development, pp. 220-226.

46. Noel Annan, "The Reform of Higher Education," Political Quarterly 38 (July-September 1967), p. 243.

47. The NUS and the AUT play more of an adversary role; the latter, for example, was recognized by the government as a full-fledged partner in salary negotiations for university staff only in 1970. In 1976, spurred by the enforced austerity of recent years, the AUT membership voted to join the national Trades Union Congress.

48. This followed the pattern established by Bryce's statutes for Manchester in 1870, when the teaching body still consisted mainly of professors. But by the early 1900s, as the charters of the first civic universities were drawn up, professors were already in a minority of less than one in three, as Moodie and Eustace point out (British Universities, pp. 38-39). The original oligarchical pattern persisted long after its intention was obsolete.

49. Bruce R. Williams, "University Values and University Organization," Minerva 10 (April 1972), p. 274.

NOTES
Chapter 6 -- Great Britain

50. Colin Crouch, "Britain," in Students, University and Society: A Comparative Sociological Review, ed. Margaret Scotford Archer (London: Heinemann, 1972), p. 197.

51. Cf. Fielden et al., Planning, pp. 53-54, 67-69. "If the earlier power and authority of the Council as a body has diminished, or is now shared with the Senate, the role of individual lay members is probably increasing in importance.... The contribution they can now make need not be restricted exclusively to membership of the Council or its committees" (p. 67).

52. This paragraph is based on H. J. Perkin, New Universities in the United Kingdom (Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1969), pp. 139-150. The UGC is cited on p. 142.

53. Perkin, New Universities, p. 147.

54. Eustace, "Origins of Self-Government," pp. 30-31 (note 2).

55. Eric Ashby and Mary Anderson, The Rise of The Student Estate in Britain (London: Macmillan, 1970), pp. 109-110; the occasion was the approval of charters for the upgraded CATs.

NOTES
Chapter 6 -- Great Britain

55. Higher Education. Report of the Committee appointed by the Prime Minister under the chairmanship of Lord Robbins, 1961-63 (London: HMSO, 1963), p. 8.

57. Brian MacArthur, Beyond 1980: The Evolution of British Higher Education (New York: International Council for Educational Development, 1975), p. 8.

58. Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Pay of Non-University Teachers (London: HMSO, 1974).

59. MacArthur, Beyond 1980, p. 10.

60. Pratt and Burgess, Polytechnics, are the best-known proponents of this critique; their volume includes the basic documents setting forth the government's policy for the polytechnics. A recent study largely confirming their analysis is Lex Donaldson, Policy and the Polytechnics: Pluralistic Drift in Higher Education (Farnborough: Saxon House, 1975).

61. Times Higher Education Supplement, 14 November 1975.

62. Anthony Crosland, who took over the DES soon after the Labour government came to power in 1964, has revealingly confessed that at the time of his April 1965 speech proclaiming the binary policy--the absolute division between university and nonuniversity sectors--he did not yet fully understand

its ramifications, but yielded to the desire of his civil servants "to get the policy on the record as soon as possible." Maurice Kogan, Edward Boyle, and Anthony Crosland, The Politics of Education (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971), pp. 193-194.

63. OECD, Reviews of National Policies For Education: Educational Development Strategy in England and Wales (Paris: Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 1975), p. 29. For a more specific and bitter critique, see J. R. Lukes, "Power and Policy at the DES: A Case Study," Universities Quarterly 29 (Spring 1975):133-165. The OECD Report provoked Parliament to establish a select committee to look into the structure and procedures of the DES.

64. Hugh Heclo and Aaron Wildavsky, The Private Government of Public Money: Community and Policy inside British Politics (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974). The concepts of community and trust are among the keystones of their analysis.

INSTITUTION FOR SOCIAL AND POLICY STUDIES

The mission of the Institution for Social and Policy Studies (ISPS) is to encourage and undertake multidisciplinary research and education. The ISPS is oriented to the exploration of social problems rather than to the refinement of discipline-based methodology. In recent years, ISPS research has focused on the problems of the city, education, health service delivery, and on the modeling of social systems. Currently, research is also being developed on criminal justice, governmental reform, environment, income distribution, aging, the policy-making process, and value problems in public policy. ISPS is not a consulting organization but an instrument for enriching the social sciences and related disciplines in the University.

Institution for Social and Policy Studies
16A Yale Station (111 Prospect Street)
New Haven, Connecticut 06520